DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 250 SP 030 635

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Preservice Teacher Education: The Application of Scheffe's LSD Matrix of Multiple Comparisons to Evaluation Efforts.
PUB DATE 6 Oct 88
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Competence; *Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors

ABSTRACT

This follow-up study of preservice teachers contains data relative to the undergraduates' self-evaluation of teaching abilities, and the assessments administered through the application of the same rating scale by the respective cooperating teachers and university supervisors. A total of 58 undergraduates participated in the study. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self-evaluation of their ability to demonstrate 25 teaching competencies. Cooperating teachers' and supervisors' evaluations were based on the same competencies. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to the data in order to determine significant differences in the assessments made by the student teachers' self-evaluation and the respective evaluations made by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Statistics obtained from the study are displayed in tables and the evaluation instruments are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: THE APPLICATION OF SCHEFFE'S LSD MATRIX OF MULTIPLE COMPARISONS TO EVALUATIVE EFFORTS

ED299250

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. L. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OCTOBER 6, 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 030 635

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 3

Research Design 4

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Analysis of Variance . . .5

The Level of Significance 11

Tables 1-25 7

The Mean and Standard Deviation for Each Competency

Tables 26-50. 33

The Analysis of Variance, Multiple Comparisons: Scheffe's LSD, A Matrix of Probabilities Relative to Each Competency

Table 51. 58

Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance Regarding the Variance Among Evaluators

Table 52. 60

Significant Differences

Conclusion. 61

Appendix A. 62

The Evaluative Instruments

PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION ASSESSMENTS: A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

This study of preservice teacher education student teachers involved a population of 19 (n = 19) undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's teacher preparation program during Fall Semester of 1986 and 39 (n = 39) undergraduates during the Spring semester of 1987 for a total of 58 (N = 58) undergraduates. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self evaluation regarding the ability to demonstrate twenty-five teaching competencies. In addition, the student teaching evaluations completed during the Fall of 1986 and the Spring of 1987 by the above undergraduates' cooperating teacher(s) (n = 26, Fall 1986 and n = 47, Spring 1987) and university supervisor (n = 21, Fall 1986 and n = 42, Spring 1987) were also included regarding the evaluation of the very same teaching-learning competencies.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the mean values and the degree of variance found existing among evaluators in their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice teacher education students as student teachers. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What are the mean values derived from the self-evaluations applied by each student teacher in regards to the twenty-five competencies related to the teaching-learning process?
2. What are the mean values relative to the performance of these same student teachers as measured with the same rating scale by their respective cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?
3. Are there any significant differences between the self-evaluation conducted by the student teachers, and the respective evaluations of the student teachers as derived from the cooperating teachers and university supervisors relative to the same twenty-five competencies?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency (Appendix A).

At the end of student teaching, the student teacher, cooperating teacher,and university supervisor completed the rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. The data were obtained from the above and tabulated and analyzed on the computer. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of Tables 1 through 25 lists the numbers on the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. In addition, the respondents were to check NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the number of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations relative to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Analysis of Variance

Tables 1 through 25 show the mean scores and standard deviations for the twenty-five competencies related to teaching as represented by the Fall, 1986 and Spring, 1987 student teachers. Mean scores were obtained in regards to the student teacher's perception of his/her competencies

related to the teaching-learning process. Tables 26-50 illustrate the multiple comparisons of the above three groups of evaluators as provided through the application of the analysis of variance by using Scheffe's levels of significant differences (LSD). A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency through the multiple comparisons provided in Scheffe's LSD relative to the above groups of evaluators assessing the competence of the Fall 1986 and Spring 1987 student teachers.

The Level of Significance

Since a (p) value between 0.05 is usually thought of as marginally significant, anything greater was labeled in this study as a nonsignificant difference. Tables 25 through 50 show the matrix of probabilities illustrated through the application of Scheffe's multiple comparisons for each of the mean scores of Fall semester 1985 and Spring Semester 1986 to the mean scores derived from the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The variability which occurred within this study was depicted through taking into account the size and location of each individual score in terms of each respective mean score derived from the three groups of respondents. Table 51 lists the differences found among and within the various mean scores. It can readily be noticed that the assessments of the specific competencies were significantly different in seven instances. Thus, no significant differences were

derived from the three different groups of evaluators in forty-three comparisons. There were only seven instances found where significant differences were noted at or below the .05 level of significance. These particular differences occurred while rating the student teacher on five of the twenty-five competencies. Thus, there were no significant differences noted among all the evaluators when the student teachers were rated on the other twenty competencies.

TABLE 1

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 1-PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	1	1	0	1
4	4	9	5	8	3	6
5	13	28	19	37	17	35
Competent						
NA	1	2	1	1	1	0
Mean	4.67	4.76	4.72	4.78	4.85	4.81
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.43	0.54	0.47	0.37	0.45

TABLE 2

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 2-MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	0	1
3	0	2	3	3	0	2
4	9	12	3	15	5	6
5	10	25	19	29	16	33
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.53	4.59	4.54	4.55	4.76	4.69
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.59	0.86	0.62	0.44	0.68

TABLE 3

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 3-CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO TEACH

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp. 87
	N=19	N=39	N=26	N=47	N=21	N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	1	0	2
3	2	3	1	3	1	3
4	7	15	9	14	8	12
5	10	21	14	29	12	24
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.42	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.52	4.41
Standard						
Deviation	0.69	0.6	0.89	0.72	0.60	0.84

TABLE 4

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 4-MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	1	1	1	0
4	7	14	7	8	5	5
5	12	25	18	38	14	37
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.63	4.64	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.88
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.49	0.56	0.46	0.59	0.33

TABLE 5

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 5-COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN CLASSROOM

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	2	2	0	0
3	3	0	3	5	0	4
4	8	17	4	14	6	9
5	8	20	17	26	14	29
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.26	4.41	4.38	4.36	4.70	4.60
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.75	0.98	0.85	0.47	0.66

TABLE 6

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 6-PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	2	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	2
3	1	2	0	2	0	0
4	1	11	2	4	0	1
5	7	11	5	17	3	16
Competent						
NA	10	12	19	14	18	23
Mean	4.67	4.04	4.71	4.65	5.00	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.71	1.16	0.49	0.65	0.00	0.96

TABLE 7

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 7-REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	0	2	4	0	0
4	4	5	5	5	2	7
5	15	34	19	37	19	35
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.79	4.87	4.65	4.66	4.90	4.83
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.34	0.63	0.73	0.30	0.38

TABLE 8

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 8-PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	2	0	0	2	1	0
4	6	12	7	5	3	1
5	11	27	19	38	16	37
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	4
Mean	4.47	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.75	4.97
Standard Deviation	0.70	0.47	0.45	0.84	0.55	0.16

TABLE 9

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 9-PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	1	2	2	0	0
4	3	10	4	3	1	2
5	14	26	19	36	11	33
Competent						
NA	1	2	1	5	10	7
Mean	4.72	4.68	4.68	4.76	4.91	4.94
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.53	0.63	0.66	0.30	0.24

TABLE 10

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 10-USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	0	1	0	0
3	1	1	3	4	1	4
4	4	9	6	8	6	6
5	14	27	17	33	14	32
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean	4.68	4.56	4.54	4.59	4.62	4.67
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.79	0.71	0.75	0.59	0.65

TABLE 11

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 11-DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	1	0	0
3	2	2	5	9	1	6
4	7	17	6	9	6	15
5	10	19	13	28	14	19
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	0	0	2
Mean	4.42	4.45	4.15	4.36	4.62	4.32
Standard Deviation	0.69	0.60	1.01	0.87	0.59	0.73

TABLE 12

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 12-DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=26	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	4	4	2	1	1
4	6	13	7	12	7	9
5	13	22	15	31	13	32
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.59	4.57	4.74
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.68	0.76	0.69	0.60	0.50

TABLE 13

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 13-OBTAIN APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	0	1	0	0
3	1	4	1	1	1	2
4	6	6	7	11	4	7
5	12	27	16	33	16	33
Competent						
NA	0	0	2	1	0	0
Mean	4.58	4.49	4.63	4.65	4.71	4.74
Standard Deviation	0.61	0.88	0.58	0.64	0.56	0.54

TABLE 14

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 14-CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	2	0	0
3	1	6	2	4	1	6
4	8	15	10	15	5	15
5	10	18	13	26	15	21
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.47	4.31	4.35	4.38	4.67	4.36
Standard Deviation	0.61	0.73	0.80	0.82	0.58	0.73

TABLE 15

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 15-PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	0	0	2	1	0	0
3	3	3	2	5	0	5
4	6	17	5	14	7	10
5	9	18	17	27	14	27
Competent						
NA	1	1	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.33	4.39	4.42	4.43	4.67	4.52
Standard Deviation	0.77	0.64	0.95	0.77	0.48	0.71

TABLE 16

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 16-MANAGES CLASSROOM FACILITIES EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	2	0	1
3	2	2	2	1	0	2
4	6	19	5	13	5	13
5	11	18	16	31	16	26
Competent						
NA	0	0	2	0	0	0
Mean	4.47	4.41	4.50	4.55	4.76	4.52
Standard Deviation	0.70	0.59	0.83	0.75	0.44	0.71

TABLE 17

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 17-MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	2	2	0	2
3	3	7	1	4	0	6
4	8	18	12	20	8	16
5	8	14	11	20	12	18
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.26	4.18	4.23	4.19	4.60	4.19
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.72	0.86	0.92	0.50	0.86

TABLE 18

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 18-DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	1	0	0	3
3	2	9	3	2	1	1
4	7	10	4	13	4	13
5	9	16	12	25	9	19
Competent						
NA	1	3	6	7	7	6
Mean	4.39	4.14	4.35	4.57	4.57	4.44
Standard Deviation	0.70	0.90	0.93	0.59	0.65	0.89

TABLE 19

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 19-ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	0	0	3
3	1	4	1	3	0	1
4	10	14	8	9	5	11
5	7	21	13	32	13	25
Competent						
NA	1	0	2	3	3	2
Mean	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.66	4.72	4.45
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.68	0.92	0.61	0.46	0.88

TABLE 20

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 20-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	1	0	1	0	2
4	3	10	0	7	1	3
5	10	23	16	24	9	28
Competent						
NA	5	5	10	15	11	9
Mean	4.64	4.65	5.00	4.72	4.90	4.79
Standard Deviation	0.63	0.54	0.00	0.52	0.32	0.55

TABLE 21

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 21-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teaches		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp. 87
	N=19	N=39	N=26	N=47	N=21	N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	2	0	0	0
3	1	6	2	2	0	1
4	11	15	6	14	3	12
5	5	12	13	24	12	19
Competent						
NA	2	5	3	7	6	10
Mean	4.24	4.12	4.30	4.55	4.80	4.56
Standard						
Deviation	0.56	0.81	0.97	0.60	0.41	0.56

TABLE 22

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 22-DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	1	3	7	0	3
4	3	8	6	8	4	8
5	16	30	17	32	17	30
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.84	4.74	4.54	4.53	4.81	4.60
Standard Deviation	0.37	0.50	0.71	0.75	0.40	0.73

TABLE 23

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 23-COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp. 87
	N=19	N=39	N=26	N=47	N=21	N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	4	2	4	1	3
4	6	11	6	8	5	10
5	10	22	12	28	9	20
Competent						
NA	2	2	6	7	6	9
Mean	4.53	4.49	4.50	4.60	4.53	4.52
Standard						
Deviation	0.62	0.69	0.69	0.67	0.64	0.67

TABLE 24

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 24-COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp.87	Fall 86	Sp. 87
	N=19	N=39	N=26	N=47	N=21	N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	2	0	0
4	3	4	2	4	4	5
5	16	35	24	41	15	37
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	2	0
Mean	4.84	4.90	4.92	4.83	4.79	4.88
Standard						
Deviation	0.37	0.31	0.27	0.48	0.42	0.33

TABLE 25

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 25-MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL, OPEN MINDEDNESS, FLEXIBILITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 86 N=19	Sp.87 N=39	Fall 86 N=26	Sp.87 N=47	Fall 86 N=21	Sp. 87 N=42
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	2	0	1
3	0	1	1	2	0	1
4	4	10	3	5	3	9
5	15	28	22	37	18	31
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean	4.79	4.69	4.81	4.67	4.86	4.67
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.52	0.49	0.76	0.36	0.65

TABLE 26

PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.776	*.194
Cooperating Teachers	.776	1.000	**.364
University Supervisors	*.194	**.364	1.000

*p< .194 or .19 level of significance

**p< .364 or .36 level of significance

TABLE 27

MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.926	**.050
Cooperating Teachers	.926	1.000	*.040
University Supervisors	**.050	*.040	1.000

*p< .040 or .04 level of significance

**p< .050 or .05 level of significance

TABLE 28

CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO TEACH

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.994	**.955
Cooperating Teachers	.994	1.000	*.913
University Supervisors	**.955	*.913	1.000

*p< .913 or .91 level of significance

**p< .955 or .96 level of significance

TABLE 29

MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.762	*.565
Cooperating Teachers	**.762	1.000	.921
University Supervisors	*.565	.921	1.000

*p< .565 or .57 level of significance

**p< .762 or .76 level of significance

TABLE 30

COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN THE CLASSROOM

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.897	*.053
Cooperating Teachers	.897	1.000	**.072
University Supervisors	*.053	**.072	1.000

*p< .053 or .05 level of significance

**p< .072 or.07 level of significance

TABLE 31

PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.610	*.419
Cooperating Teachers	**.610	1.000	.906
University Supervisors	*.419	.906	1.000

*p< .419 or .42 level of significance

**p< .610 or.61 level of significance

TABLE 32

REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.062	.747
Cooperating Teachers	**.062	1.000	*.038
University Supervisors	.747	*.038	1.000

*p< .038 or .04 level of significance

**p< .062 or.06 level of significance

TABLE 33

PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.708	*.247
Cooperating Teachers	.708	1.000	**.527
University Supervisors	*.247	**.527	1.000

*p< .247 or .25 level of significance

**p< .527 or.53 level of significance

TABLE 34

PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.878	*.022
Cooperating Teachers	.878	1.000	**.029
University Supervisors	*.022	**.029	1.000

*p< .022 or .02 level of significance

**p< .029 or.03 level of significance

TABLE 35

USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.667	.910
Cooperating Teachers	**.667	1.000	*.469
University Supervisors	.910	*.469	1.000

*p< .469 or .47 level of significance

**p< .667 or.68 level of significance

TABLE 36

DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.557	.975
Cooperating Teachers	**.557	1.000	*.458
University Supervisors	.975	*.458	1.000

*p< .458 or .46 level of significance

**p< .557 or.56 level of significance

TABLE 37

DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.891	**.825
Cooperating Teachers	.891	1.000	*.590
University Supervisors	**.825	*.590	1.000

*p< .590 or .59 level of significance

**p< .825 or.83 level of significance

TABLE 38

OBTAINS APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.164	*.039
Cooperating Teachers	**.164	1.000	.247
University Supervisors	*.039	.247	1.000

*p< .039 or .04 level of significance

**p< .164 or.16 level of significance

TABLE 39

CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.987	**.713
Cooperating Teachers	.987	1.000	*.627
University Supervisors	**.713	*.627	1.000

*p< .627 or .63 level of significance

**p< .713 or.71 level of significance

TABLE 40

PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.659	*.084
Cooperating Teachers	.659	1.000	**.175
University Supervisors	*.084	**.175	1.000

*p< .084 or .08 level of significance

**p< .175 or.18 level of significance

TABLE 41

MANAGES CLASSROOMS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.737	*.295
Cooperating Teachers	.737	1.000	**.595
University Supervisors	*.295	**.595	1.000

*p< .295 or .30 level of significance

**p< .595 or.60 level of significance

TABLE 42

MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.998	**.641
Cooperating Teachers	.998	1.000	*.613
University Supervisors	**.641	*.613	1.000

*p< .613 or .61 level of significance

**p< .641 or.64 level of significance

TABLE 43

DEVELOPS APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.844	.898
Cooperating Teachers	**.844	1.000	*.619
University Supervisors	.898	*.619	1.000

*p< .619 or .62 level of significance

**p< .844 or.84 level of significance

TABLE 44

ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.838	*.597
Cooperating Teachers	**.838	1.000	.886
University Supervisors	*.597	.886	1.000

*p< .597 or .60 level of significance

**p< .838 or.84 level of significance

TABLE 45

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.348	**.387
Cooperating Teachers	*.348	1.000	.994
University Supervisors	**.387	.994	1.000

*p< .348 or .35 level of significance

**p< .387 or.39 level of significance

TABLE 46

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.385	*.098
Cooperating Teachers	.385	1.000	**.363
University Supervisors	*.098	**.363	1.000

*p< .098 or .10 level of significance

**p< .363 or.36 level of significance

TABLE 47

DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.160	.703
Cooperating Teachers	*.160	1.000	**.337
University Supervisors	.703	**.337	1.000

*p< .160 or .16 level of significance

**p< .337 or.34 level of significance

TABLE 48

COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.697	.945
Cooperating Teachers	*.697	1.000	**.858
University Supervisors	.945	**.858	1.000

*p< .697 or .70 level of significance

**p< .858 or.86 level of significance

TABLE 49

COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.997	**.839
Cooperating Teachers	.997	1.000	*.799
University Supervisors	**.839	*.799	1.000

*p< .799 or .80 level of significance

**p< .839 or.84 level of significance

TABLE 50

MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL

OPEN-MINDEDNESS, AND FLEXIBILITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	**1.000	**1.00	*.974
Cooperating Teachers	**1.000	**1.000	*.974
University Supervisors	*.974	*.974	**1.000

*p< .974 or .97 level of significance

**p< 1.00 level of significance

TABLE 51

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Significance Level	Evaluators Showing Variance Between Each Other
Professional Ethics	.19	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Professional Ethics	.36	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Enthusiasm for Teaching	.04	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Enthusiasm for Teaching	.05	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Confidence in Ability	.91	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Confidence in Ability	.96	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Professional Appearance	.57	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Professional Appearance	.76	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Classroom Communication	.05	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Classroom Communication	.07	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Professional Organization	.42	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Professional Organization	.61	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.04	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Profits from Suggestions	.06	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.25	Student Teacher - Univ.Supervisor
Practices Punctuality	.53	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Uses Appropriate Resources	.47	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Uses Appropriate Resources	.68	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.46	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Determines Student Needs	.56	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Develops Lesson Plans	.59	Coop. Teach. - Univ. Supervisor
Develops Lesson Plans	.83	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Obtains Resources for Teaching	.04	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Obtains Resources for Teaching	.16	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Variance Between Each Other
Strategies for Teaching	.63	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Strategies for Teaching	.71	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Presents Effective Lessons	.08	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Presents Effective Lessons	.18	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Manages Classroom Effectively	.30	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Manages Classroom Effectively	.60	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Manages Classroom Behavior	.61	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Manages Classroom Behavior	.64	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Develops Evaluation Devices	.62	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Develops Evaluation Devices	.84	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Interprets Student Progress	.60	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Interprets Student Progress	.84	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.35	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.39	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Works with Exceptional Student	.10	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Works with Exceptional Student	.36	Coop. Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Develops Rapport with Student	.16	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Develops Rapport with Student	.34	Univ. Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Counsels Student Appropriately	.70	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher
Counsels Student Appropriately	.86	Univ. Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Cooperates with School Staff	.80	Univ. Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Cooperates with School Staff	.84	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Proper Personal Behavior	.97	Student Teacher - Univ. Supervisor
Proper Personal Behavior	1.00	Student Teacher - Coop. Teacher

TABLE 51

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES DERIVED THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF SCHEFFE'S LSD - MULTIPLE COMPARISONS RELATIVE TO THE EVALUATION OF FALL 1986 AND SPRING 1987 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	(p) = .05 Or Lower Level Of Significance	Evaluators With Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Participates in School Activities	.02	Student Teacher University Supervisor
Participates in School Activities	.03	Cooperating Teacher University Supervisor
Maintains Enthusiasm for Teaching	.04	Cooperating Teacher University Supervisor
Profits from Suggestions	.04	Cooperating Teacher University Supervisor
Obtains Appropriate Resources for Teaching	.04	Student Teacher University Supervisor
Maintains Enthusiasm for Teaching	.05	Student Teacher University Supervisor
Communicates Effectively in Classroom	.05	Student Teacher University Supervisor

Conclusion

The mean values derived from the application of the rating scale by the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors relative to the student teachers' ability to demonstrate twenty-five competencies were in most instances not significantly different for the three groups of evaluators. Only seven instances out of a possible fifty comparisons were found where significant differences existed at or below the .05 level of significance.

The greatest differences were found to exist between the evaluations derived from the student teachers and the evaluations obtained from the university supervisors (e.g. p =.02). This particular competency dealt with the degree of participation of the student teacher in school activities. The cooperating teacher also differed significantly with the university supervisor in the assessment of this same competency (e.g. p = .03). The application of the rating scale relative to the student teachers maintaining enthusiasm for teaching, profiting from suggestions, and obtaining appropriate resources for teaching showed significant differences between the cooperating teachers and the university supervisor in two out of the three instances (e.g. p = .04). The other instance at the .04 level of significance dealt with differences between the student teachers and the university supervisors relative to measuring the competency of obtaining appropriate resources for teaching. The student teachers and the university supervisors also different significantly regarding the measurement of the competency of maintaining enthusiasm for teaching and communicating effectively in the classroom (e.g. p = .05).

APPENDIX A
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
Student's Signature

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Cooperating Teacher

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
University Supervisor